231 We did not see dogs hunting, but those that we saw around the homes looked extraordinarily mangy and ill-found and acted as if they could be of no possible use. Some are merely kept as pets and the children play with them but the adults generally ignore them completely. [171] None of them are watchdogs or show any courage or assertiveness. It was said that the Maquiritares raise exceptionally good hunting dogs, and that these are sometimes acquired by trading, but we saw none of this favored breed.[117] [172] The curious fact that the Kamarakotos use the Spanish word for "dog" (which they pronounce peró, not perro), although there is a widespread Carib name for them, suggests that the Kamarakotos may not have had dogs until recently, although other Carib tribes apparently have had them a long time, probably since pre-Columbian times. In any case, dogs play a very minor role among the Kamarakotos and are far less abundant and useful than among many allied Indians.

411 174 [174] Most of the Guayana and Amazon Indians seem formerly to have used wooden clubs, often elaborately carved and decorated and of characteristic form for each tribe (see Schomburgk, Koch-Grünberg, Roth, and, indeed, almost any detailed account of travels in this general region). Used mainly for warfare, now an obsolescent occupation, these clubs seem almost everywhere to be dropping out of use. The Kamarakotos undoubtedly formerly used these, but I saw none among them, and could obtain no evidence that they are now made or used, even, as among many tribes, as ceremonial or dance accessories.

Fishing.

226 [242] [423] 72 [685] Fish is a favorite food of the Indians and fishing is a favorite sport and, in the case of fish poisoning, social event. Fishing rights are well defined and jealously guarded — the only serious Indian war that the Kamarakotos remember arose from infringement of these rights and such infringement is still, in theory at least, a capital offense.

Fish are taken with bow and arrow, hook and line, hand net, trap, and poison. Fish spears and casting or set nets appear to be unknown. The principal fishing arrow, waibakasi, has already been described. The trident fishing arrow of some allied tribes was not seen, and this method of catching fish is not now much used by the Kamarakotos, especially as large fish are now rare. In fish-poisoning some of the fish that are stunned but not dead are shot with arrows, usually mere sharpened sticks, but this is more a sport for the boys (and more sportive men) than a serious method of obtaining the fish.

227 [172] [439] All the Indians of the Guianas and Venezuela and most of those of Brazil by now have steel hooks of foreign manufacture, a favorite article of trade that penetrated the region farther and faster than explorers have. They have a native name, kunoi' in Kamarakoto, and doubtless have displaced native wooden hooks although these are now quite unknown to the Kamarakotos who consider

117 [see footnote on p. 320, category 116 - Analysis]

462 women do rather more than half of the heavy carrying, but I have already noted that the men are really ready to assist if needed, and the men do considerable work, such as the very laborious basketwork, that might, a priori, be believed to be woman's work.

[171] The general pattern of this division of labor is typically Carib, but the details vary much from tribe to tribe. For instance planting, here done by the man, is commonly woman's work elsewhere and hammocks, here made by women, are often made by men elsewhere.

Legal Concepts

Property.

421 The Indians are not capitalists in that they have no permanent title to real property, no personal command of the means of production, no accumulated or hereditary wealth, and no property right in the labor of others. At the same time they have a very real and lively sense of personal property and in other ways also their society is decidedly not communistic. In general what an individual makes or uses is his. When he ceases to use it, it reverts to the public domain.

423 Thus it could be said that the land, in general, belongs to the tribe in common, or that it belongs to no one, but when a man clears a conuco or builds a house on a portion of land, that land is his. No one has the right to use it (or even to enter it against his wishes) as long as he is in occupation, and its products are exclusively his, free of any obligation to share or divide them. When he leaves it, however, he cannot transfer title to it. It reverts to commons and any comer can occupy it or enjoy its fruits and use. The same is true of structures erected on the land.

592 Such property may be said to belong to the household group or to the
423 to>-esa? as its leader and representative. Another very important special case
226 of such ownership is that of fishing rights. According to custom, which of course is the equivalent of uncodified law, a household established on or near a stream owns the fishing rights on that stream from its dwelling downstream as far as the next habitation. These rights are very rigidly maintained. Even a fish killed upstream is lost to the killer if it floats below the next household before being gathered. Of course several or many households do commonly unite in poisoning a given stretch of water and all share in the results, but this is only by invitation of the household owning the right to that water. Violation [685] [221] of these rights is among the most serious offenses known to the Indians, as is suggested by the fact that the last bloody war, of which they retain vivid but [224] confused memories, is said to have arisen from such a violation. There seems, on the other hand, to be no proprietorship of hunting rights.

461 would trade his labor for goods for his family rather than for himself. Among
465 the Indians themselves the employment of labor is not uncommon and is paid
[478] either by labor in return or by goods, such as baskets or other common objects of trade. For instance one man may definitely employ another (outside his household — those in the household are of course obligated to help freely) to help erect his house and in return will do an equivalent amount of work for the man employed or will give him an equitable amount of food, drink, or articles of trade. This practice contains the germs of definite class differentiation into employees and laborers, but such differentiation has not at all occurred as yet.
[558] Generally speaking, there is no pronounced difference in wealth between different households and no one man is much more likely to be an employer than an employee.

Crime and Punishment.

173 According to present statements, the ancient penal code of the tribe, if
673 an indefinite and unwritten customary handling of the problem of crime can be
[681] so called, recognized basically only one crime, that of being hopelessly undesirable, and one punishment, death. Judgment as to the undesirability of a
[682] [685] member of the tribe was based on the commission of antisocial actions, among
173 which unjustified murder, violation of fishing rights, and habitual thievery
692 were specifically mentioned. A household might take matters into its own
643 hands, but this was considered undesirable and the regular, one might say the
[627] truly legal, procedure was to lay the complaint before the cacique who judged its accuracy and gravity, but apparently without holding anything resembling
[696] a formal hearing or trial. If he condemned the criminal, he assigned the duty of executing him to any members of the tribe, such as the male complainants, and the sentence was carried out without further formality as soon as opportunity presented.

674 At present, the Indians say, crime is so nearly unknown that no regular
[681] system of punishment is required. It is easy to believe that serious crime is
[152] extremely rare as the amity of the Kamarakotos is amazing. Even when they
[273] were violently drunk no quarreling was seen, still less any attempts at physical injury. They are, however, human and it is incredible that no crime ever is
[178] committed. From answers to hypothetical questions as to what would be done if a crime should occur, it is evident that the old code is still considered natural and just and I have no doubt that it would be, and probably is, still applied if
685 occasion arises. Specifically, it was stated that unprovoked murder and serious
[682] violation of fishing rights merit death and that this should be administered un-
[696] der direction of the cacique but might well be undertaken by the injured house-
[627] hold on its own initiative. Theft, on the other hand, is now considered theoretically (and probably also in practice although no specific instance could be

685 adduced) to be sufficiently compensated by the forceable recovery of the stolen objects or of others of equal value, without any penalty. Within the central group theft must, however, necessarily be rare because it could hardly fail of 681 instant detection.[170] The wholly non-Indian punishment of imprisonment is unknown, and the Indian punishments of whipping and of biting by ants were also said not to be in use here.

673 No actions other than physical injury, trespass (particularly on fishing waters), and theft were specifically cited as criminal and of conceivable occurrence. Voluntary cohabitation among the unmarried is not criminal, or even reprehensible, and rape and adultery are claimed to be unknown (a most [609] unlikely statement, but no other information was obtainable). It should, how- [684] ever, be recalled that at least one non-Indian traveler is rumored to have been executed for rape or seduction, but this was generally denied, as it probably 674 would be, whether true or not. In such a culture and community most of the crimes on our statute books are nearly or quite impossible: fraud could hardly ever be successful, debts are seldom contracted and early payment could not be avoided if possible at all, and there are no taxes, licenses, or any of the other hundred and one fruitful causes of crimes and misdemeanors in more complex cultures.

858 It might be noted here also that in such cases as we saw the minor misde- 861 meanors of children were not punished in any way and such punishment was said to be neither necessary nor customary.

Trade

433 The Kamarakotos do not have and, as far as one can judge from present conditions, have never had a completely self-contained economy. It is true that they could survive and even live comfortably on the products of their own region and their own labor, but it is also true that they do not and that the ne- [177] cessity would mean a marked change in their way of life. Nor is this true simply 439 because they now use some non-Indian materials and articles. They also re- [407] quire various products to be obtained from other Indian tribes. It is certain that [171] the Guiana tribes in general had well established trade routes and a far-flung system of inter-tribal trade long before white men appeared. This trade still flourishes.

437 All trade is by barter, in the truest sense. The parties normally exchange things that each wants for his own use at the moment, not accepting articles that serve as tokens for further exchange or that are to be kept for future use. The only advance beyond this basic type of barter is that intermediate barter is also practiced to some extent. An Indian will accept or even seek something that he himself does not want at the moment, but only if he knows that he can

170 [see footnote on p. 327, category 116 – Analyst]